

1  
2  
3  
4

5 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
6 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

7  
8 EZEQUIEL ROMO, No. C-13-5341 EMC (pr)

9 Petitioner,  
10 v.

11 G. LEWIS, Warden,  
12 Respondent.

---

13  
14 ORDER DENYING MOTION FOR  
15 RECONSIDERATION

16 Petitioner has moved for reconsideration of the dismissal of his petition for writ of habeas  
17 corpus. “Reconsideration is appropriate if the district court (1) is presented with newly discovered  
18 evidence, (2) committed clear error or the initial decision was manifestly unjust, or (3) if there is an  
19 intervening change in controlling law.” *School Dist. No. 1J v. ACandS, Inc.*, 5 F.3d 1255, 1263 (9th  
20 Cir. 1993). Petitioner reargues his case but does not show newly discovered evidence, clear error,  
manifest injustice or an intervening change in the controlling law. Accordingly, the motion for  
reconsideration is DENIED. (Docket # 9.)

21

22 IT IS SO ORDERED.

23  
24 Dated: October 6, 2014

25  
26   
EDWARD M. CHEN  
27 United States District Judge  
28